## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested. Claims 1-22 and 31 are in this application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 23-30 and 32-33 have been cancelled. Claims 3-22 and 31 have been withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because the drawings do not show first and second saw streets that can extend in a straight line from one edge of the wafer to the other edge of the wafer. Applicant notes, however, that applicant's FIG. 1 shows a plurality of first saw streets 116 and a plurality of second saw streets 118 that extend in a straight line from one edge of the wafer to the other edge of the wafer. Thus, from what applicant can determine, FIG. 1 shows the features specified in the claims. (Reference to a point on the edge was deleted to broaden the claim.)

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mok et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,799,976) in view of Byrd et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,809,378). For the reasons set forth below, applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites:

> "a plurality of semiconductor circuits formed on the semiconductor wafer, each semiconductor circuit having a pair of first sides that are parallel to each other, and a pair of second sides that are parallel to each other and perpendicular to the pair of first sides;
>
> "a plurality of first saw streets that run parallel to the first sides between a number of the semiconductor circuits, each first saw street extending in a straight line from an edge of the wafer to another edge of the wafer;
>
> "a plurality of second saw streets that run parallel to the second sides between a number of the semiconductor circuits, each second saw street extending in a straight line from an edge of the wafer to another edge of the wafer;

"a first metal trace formed between a first saw street and a first semiconductor circuit, the first metal trace being electrically isolated from each semiconductor circuit and not crossing the first saw street; and

"a second metal trace formed between the first saw street and a second semiconductor circuit, the second metal trace being electrically isolated from each semiconductor circuit and not crossing the first saw street, the first saw street lying between the first semiconductor circuit and the second semiconductor circuit."

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner pointed to dice 5 shown in FIG. 1(b) of Byrd as constituting the plurality of semiconductor circuits required by claim 1. Further, the Examiner pointed to saw street AA shown in an annotated copy of FIG. 1(b) of Byrd as constituting a first saw street of claim 1, and saw street BB shown in the annotated copy of FIG. 1(b) of Byrd as constituting a second saw street of claim 1. In addition, the Examiner pointed to conductors 1 and 3 shown in FIG. 1(b) of Byrd as constituting the first and second metal traces required by claim 1.

Conductors 1 and 3, however, can not be read to be the first and second metal traces required by claim 1 because conductors 1 and 3 are not electrically isolated from each semiconductor circuit 5. Rather, as shown in FIG. 1(b), conductors 1 and 3 of Byrd are electrically connected to each dice 5 by devices (fuses) 7.

Further, Byrd teaches that devices (fuses) 7 are used to electrically isolate a dice 5 when the dice 5 has failed the wafer level test. (See column 4, lines 29-35 of Byrd.) In addition, in the event that all of the dice 5 on a wafer are bad, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to blow each fuse 7 to isolate each dice 5 as there would be no reason to do this. Instead, one skilled in the art would be motivated to simply throw the wafer away, or send the wafer away to determine the cause of the failure if needed.

Thus, since conductors 1 and 3 are not electrically isolated from each dice 5, conductors 1 and 3 can not be read to be the first and second metal traces of claim 1. As a result, claim 1 is patentable over Mok in view of Byrd. In addition, since

claim 2 depends from claim 1, claim 2 is patentable over Mok in view of Byrd for the same reasons as claim 1.

Thus, for the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that all of the claims are in a condition for allowance. Therefore, the Examiner's early re-examination and reconsideration are respectively requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6-6-05 By: Mark C. Pickering

Mark C. Pickering
Registration No. 36,239
Attorney for Assignee

P.O. Box 300
Petaluma, CA 94953-0300
Telephone: (707) 762-5500
Facsimile: (707) 762-5504
Customer No. 33402